Appl. No. 32378

Amdt. Dated April 9, 2003

Reply to Office action of December 20, 2002

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the examiner for the careful examination given to the present application.

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office action, and it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended, is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3, and 7 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5-6 have also been amended due to formal matters.

Claims 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eckhardt (U.S. Patent No. 4,977,329). Claims 3, 4, 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Marcantonio (U.S. Patent No. 5,294,826) Claims 3, 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,495). Claim 3 has been amended. For the following reasons, the examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the references disclose or suggest "a flexible printed circuit for connecting the two groups of electronic components, said flexible printed circuit along a baffle provided at the input/output of the shield to avoid forming a penetration path for said radiation" as recited in claim 3.

Eckhardt does not disclose or teach a flexible printed circuit along a baffle. Marcantonio also does not disclose or teach a flexible printed circuit along a baffle. Therefore, Eckhardt and Marcantonio do not or teach all the elements of the claimed invention.

Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest a flexible printed circuit along a baffle. Ishikawa discloses a computer system where each function module is provided with a case to isolate it from heat radiation generated by other function modules (col. 2, lines 26-42). However, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest a flexible printed circuit along a baffle. Thus, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Appl. No. 32378 Amdt. Dated April 9, 2003

Reply to Office action of December 20, 2002

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ishikawa to arrive at the claimed invention. Ishikawa improves the heat radiating capability of computer systems by having air tight cases for each function module. Thus, there is no motivation to modify Ishikawa to include a flexible printed circuit along a baffle to avoid forming a penetration path for the radiation. The desirability of such a modification is found only in the Applicant's own description of the invention, in contrast to the requirement that the teaching or suggestion to make the modification must be found in the prior art, and not based on an applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 1-2, and 11 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections. Therefore, claims 1-2 and 11 are in allowable condition.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based upon Ishikawa is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application as amended is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. The references do not disclose or suggest such an electronic system as claimed by Applicant and further unsuggested modifications would have to be made to arrive at the presently claimed invention. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32378.

> Respectfully submitted, PEARNE & GORDON LLP

526 Superior Avenue, East **Suite 1200** Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484 (216) 579-1700

Date: April 9, 2003